

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10-12 are amended and claims 15 and 16 are added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the substitute specification under 35 U.S.C. §132 because of lack of a statement that no new matter has been added to the specification. Applicant hereby states that no new matter has been added to the specification by the substitute specification. This statement obviates the grounds for this objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Ozawa et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0097213A1) (Ozawa) and claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ozawa and apparently in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,951 to Yamazuki. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Specifically, the Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 12 and 14 by comparing some features of these claims to features of Figs. 30 and 31 and other features to different figures. Applicant notes that Figs. 30 and 31 in Ozawa represent prior art, which cannot be properly combined with the invention shown in the different figures of Ozawa to produce an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Hence, the 102(e) rejection of independent claims 1, 12 and 14 is improper.

Moreover, Applicant asserts that Ozawa fails to disclose or suggest an electro-optical device in which a signal to reset a driving transistor is supplied through a switching transistor is within a vertical scanning period, as recited in independent claims 10-11.

In particular, Ozawa teaches a display apparatus comprising interalia a first transistor supplied with a scanning signal, a second transistor which is a driving signal (page 2, first col., lines 30-42) and a setting step of supplying a first on-signal to the first (switching)

transistor (TFT 20, Figs. 15-16a; page 9, second col., lines 61-64) via the scanning line (SGATE, Fig. 16b). However, Ozawa does not disclose or suggest a driving method or an electro-optical device wherein a set step or a reset step are performed in a vertical scanning period, as recited in independent claims 10 and 11 of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claims 10 and 11 define patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1 and 10-12 define patentable subject matter. Furthermore, Applicant asserts that the claims depending on independent claims 1 and 10, for at least their dependency on these claims, also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ozawa, Applicant asserts that Ozawa should not preclude patentability of Applicant's invention under the 35 U.S.C. §103(c) exemption because Ozawa qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and both Ozawa and Applicant's invention were, at the time of the invention, subject to an obligation of assignments to the same entity (Seiko Epson Corporation). As such, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Ozawa should not preclude patentability of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is rendered moot.

Moreover, because new claims 15 and 16 recite the subject matter of allowable claims 1 and 12, and also recite the further limitation of the set-reset step being performed in a vertical scanning period (claim 15) or the signal to reset the driving transistor being supplied through the switching transistor within a vertical scanning period (claim 16), Applicant asserts that claims 15 and 16 define patentable subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JAN:TMN/vam

Date: October 2, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--